



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

literary and historical aspect in Voltaire. Now Pellissier's volume by no means makes "double emploi" with Lanson's, but it may be interesting to ask which one of the two—if we may so speak—is the right thing to do: to approach Voltaire as a man of letters or as a philosopher? In order to bring out the most valuable part of Voltaire's genius, ought he to be studied rather from the historical standpoint, adopted by Lanson, or from the abstract, philosophical standpoint, adopted by Pellissier?

The answer we should like to suggest is about this: Voltaire is the apostle of common sense; but for this very reason (as Pellissier himself admits already in his "Avant-Propos") he neglects, or overlooks, many serious problems of philosophy and life; Voltaire does not satisfy an intelligence above the average, when he simply passes by any question whenever plain common sense cannot solve it. It was just to try and give an answer to problems which are not accessible to the mediocre common sense that philosophers came; and whether they succeeded or failed, they pleased us more than Voltaire who simply ignores our higher faculties. On the other hand, if Voltaire contributed nothing to the thoughts of the élite of humanity, he contributed a great deal to the advancement of ideas in the masses; he did away with many superstitious beliefs,—he makes room for new, useful ideas; he is the most remarkable vulgarizer of thoughts; and in that domain an art like his is more important than originality, his literary talents more important than his philosophical gifts: therefore, then, it seems to us that Lanson is the one who rather than Pellissier, studied Voltaire under the more characteristic aspect of his genius.

This, at once, puts us before another question: Why did Pellissier not study Voltaire from that standpoint? Because Pellissier—many passages in the book betray this—wrote while he was pre-occupied by some very concrete things, *i. e.*, by the momentous social problems which France is just now facing. He saw in Voltaire an excellent educator of the masses, for our time as well as for the eighteenth century. He picked out Voltaire, among so many other writers, because at a time when the Church in France tries to react by ob-

scurantism against a perhaps too strong dose of realism and rationalism, a dose of Voltaire, the apostle of good common sense seemed an excellent antidote. To express things somewhat differently, Pellissier's book is interesting for us as a resurrection of the eighteenth century ideas at the beginning of the twentieth century, about as in the Renaissance we are interested to find and study a resurrection of Classical ideals in Christian communities. Or again, it is Pellissier who is interesting in the book rather than Voltaire, as *e. g.*, in Maeterlinck's book *Les abeilles*, the bees do not interest us as much as the man who wrote about them. It is a case that matches well enough the case of the late Brunetière, whose books of literary criticism ought to be read more for Brunetière's philosophy, than for the, at times, objective treatment of a subject.¹

ALBERT SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

SHAKESPEARE.

The Shakespeare Apocrypha, being a Collection of Fourteen Plays which have been ascribed to Shakespeare. Edited, with Introduction, Notes and Bibliography by C. F. TUCKER BROOKE, B. Litt., Senior Demy of Magdalen College, Oxford. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1908. 8vo., pp. lvi + 456.

There is in the entire range of the Elizabethan drama no more curious group of plays than the so-called "doubtful plays" of Shakespeare. Ever since their ascription to the pen of the master-dramatist they have been regarded with critical suspicion and in consequence of the misguided efforts of zealous champions they must suffer whatever odium attaches to presumptive illegitimacy in the anonymous drama. The basis of their ascription to Shakespeare varies quite as widely as the merits of the plays themselves. Several were deliberately issued during Shakespeare's lifetime by enterprising publishers who recognized the

¹ Only Pellissier is much more reliable than Brunetière as far as scholarship goes.

commercial value of a play in quarto written by "W. S." or "W. Sh.", or, more frankly, by "William Shakespeare." Others acquired an added value about the time of the Restoration by being described in the catalogues of careless or unscrupulous booksellers as the work of Shakespeare. A few won their way into the group by being bound together in one volume in the library of Charles II and labelled "Shakespeare. Vol. I." Seven others were included in the second imprint of the Third Folio (1664) and in the Fourth Folio (1685). Finally, a number were added to the list by such critics as Theobald, Capell, Tieck, Bernhardt and others who were guided largely by internal evidence in attributing to Shakespeare any anonymous play that contained lines or scenes of unusual merit. Of the entire thirty-five or forty plays of this character, only one (*Pericles*) is now included in the Shakespeare canon, and two others (*The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Edward III*) are found in a few modern editions of Shakespeare.

Mr. Brooke, in his admirable edition of the *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, very wisely reprinted only those plays that could reasonably be included in the "doubtful" class. They include fourteen plays in the following order: *Arden of Feversham*, *Lochrine*, *Edward III*, *Mucedorus*, *Sir John Oldcastle*, *Thomas Lord Cromwell*, *The London Prodigal*, *The Puritan*, *The Yorkshire Tragedy*, *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*, *Fair Em*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, *The Birth of Merlin* and *Sir Thomas More*. The Introduction discusses the "doubtful plays" in general and considers the merits of the particular plays included in the present edition. Strangely enough, only a few of these dramatic waifs had previously been edited with any thoroughness in England and Mr. Brooke has therefore had an opportunity to produce a volume that will undoubtedly become the standard reference-text for these dramas. The choice of the title *Shakespeare Apocrypha* is commendable, because there is slight reason for calling anything "doubtful" when very little doubt exists in most minds.

Throughout the volume there are evidences of Mr. Brooke's editorial care and grasp of his material. The original edition in each case forms the basis for the text and variant readings of later editions are given in the footnotes. Each play (ex-

cepting *Sir Thomas More*, which was first printed by Dyce in 1844) is preceded by a fac-simile of the title-page of its first quarto. The text is followed by notes, largely philological and with frequent reference to that vast treasury of word-lore, the *New English Dictionary*. The volume concludes with an extensive Bibliography embracing collected editions, separate editions, translations, general criticism, early notices, sources, analogues, etc., and an index to the bibliography.

It is no reflection upon the merit of Mr. Brooke's edition to say that his Bibliography is incomplete and not free from trifling errors. The scholar who hopes to publish an extensive bibliographical list that is all-inclusive and beyond criticism is almost inevitably doomed to disappointment. The following comments upon the Bibliography are, therefore, given for what they are worth, and are intended simply to supplement Mr. Brooke's really admirable list, without questioning his undoubted care in its compilation.

- P. 439, no. 7. Knight's Pictorial edition is in 8 vols.
- P. 439, no. 8. A second edition of *A Supplement to the Plays of William Shakespeare* was published in Philadelphia (Jas. B. Smith & Co.), 1855.
- P. 439, no. 9. This volume of Doubtful Plays formed part of an edition of Shakespeare in 4 vols. published in London by J. Tallis & Co. in [1851-1853]. As the Doubtful Plays were probably published last, the date should be [1853] rather than [1851]. This would reverse the position of nos. 9 and 10 in the Bibliography.
- P. 440, no. 17. The list omits *Mucedorus* (1878) which is given at p. 445, no. 23. Cf. Introduction, p. lv.
- P. 440. The list of separate editions of *Arden of Feversham* omits one by [A. F. Hopkinson], London (Edward White) 1890 and another by Mr. Hopkinson, not anonymously this

time, London (M. E. Sims), 1898. Neither of these is mentioned in the list at p. 440, no. 19. I find no reference to the adaptation of *Arden of Feversham* begun by George Lillo, completed by John Hoadly, printed in Lillo's *Works* (1775) and reprinted several times during the past century.

- P. 442, no. 8. In addition to this item, there was also an edition of *Edward III* privately printed by J. Payne Collier in quarto in 1874.
- P. 446, no. 12. The date should be 1894, not 1895. Cf. p. 440, no. 19.
- P. 447, no. 20. Dr. Rolfe's edition of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* appeared first in 1883, not 1891; hence nos. 19 and 20 should be reversed.
- P. 451, no. 46. For Phillips read Phillipps. A later edition of the *Outlines* (e. g., the 8th or 9th) would be preferable to the 3rd for citation.
- P. 453, no. 1. For Four volumes, 1875-7, read Five volumes, 1875-94.
- P. 454, no. 3. The Collier edition of Henslowe (1845) has been superseded by the Greg edition (vol. I, 1904). Vol. II has since appeared (1908).

To the list of critical works on the *Apocrypha* should be added:

- Howe, F. A. The Authorship of the Birth of Merlin. *Modern Philology*, iv (193-205).
- Hubbard, F. G. Repetition and Parallelism of Style in the Earlier Elizabethan Drama. *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.*, xx (360-379). Contains valuable notes on *Loocrine*.
- Schelling, F. E. The English Chronicle Play, 1902. Professor Schelling's *Elizabethan Drama* (1908) appeared after Mr. Brooke's volume went to press.
- Singer, H. W. Das bürgerliche Trauerspiel in England, 1891.

Doubtless other titles will be added to the Bibliography when a new edition of *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* is brought out.

JOHN LOUIS HANEY.

Central High School, Philadelphia.

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY LITERATURE.

The Oriental Tale in England in the Eighteenth Century. By MARTHA PIKE CONANT, Ph. D. (Columbia University Studies in Comparative Literature.) Columbia University Press, New York. Pp. xxvi + 312.

This well-conceived monograph, another of the suggestive ventures of this Series into new and interesting fields, presents fairly the scope and significance of what was in its day an important literary fashion. It contains an Introduction, chapters on the Imaginative, Moralistic, Philosophic and Satiric "Groups" among the writings under discussion, a brief Literary Estimate, Appendices with notes and bibliographical matter, and an Index. Much of this is well done. Miss Conant has read widely in the often-dull pages of the Eighteenth Century Oriental Tales themselves, and has given good descriptions of many works practically inaccessible to most readers. In her remarks upon particular books there is much sound criticism; for example, in the estimates of Gueullette's volumes (pp. 31-36), of *Charoba* (pp. 55-61), of Lyttelton's *Persian Letters* (pp. 178-186), and in the comparison of *Tom Brown* and *Dufresnoy*. The book deals more successfully, indeed, with these minor works than with the more important and familiar productions of Addison, Johnson, Voltaire, and Montesquieu.

The defects of the book are mainly matters of formulation. The author does not always say clearly and adequately what she means. In the Introduction, for example, while it is proper enough to begin with Marana's *Turkish Spy* (1687), it would be well to tell the reader that at least twenty-five other works of prose fiction, Oriental and pseudo-Oriental, had appeared in English between 1660 and 1700. The chapter on the Imaginative Group seems much too long.